arXiv:1609.00341v1 [math.OC] 1 Sep 2016

Linear Convergence of Projection Algorithms

Minh N. Dao* and Hung M. Phan†

September 2, 2016

Abstract

Projection algorithms are well known for theirs simplicity and flexibility in solving feasibility problems. They are particularly important in practice since softwares involving projection algorithms require minimal implementation and maintenance. In this paper, we study linear convergence of several projection algorithms for systems of finitely many closed sets. The results complement contemporary research on the same topic.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary: 49M27, 65K10; Secondary: 47H09, 49J52, 49M37, 65K05, 90C26.

Keywords: cyclic projections, reflection–projection algorithm, strong regularity, superregularity, R-linear convergence, quasi firm Fejér monotonicity.

1 Introduction

In this paper, X is a Euclidean space, with inner product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ and induced norm $\|\cdot\|$. Throughout, we set $I=\{1,\ldots,m\}$ and assume that $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is a system of closed (possibly nonconvex) subsets of X. The notation used in the paper is fairly standard and follows [2]. The nonnegative integers are $\mathbb{N}$, and the real numbers are $\mathbb{R}$, while $\mathbb{R}_+ := \big\{x\in\mathbb{R}\;\big|\; x\geq 0\big\}$ and $\mathbb{R}_{++} := \big\{x\in\mathbb{R}\;\big|\; x>0\big\}$. If $w\in X$ and $\rho\in\mathbb{R}_{++}$, then $\mathbb{B}_\rho(w) := \big\{x\in X\;\big|\;\|x-w\|\leq\rho\big\}$ is the closed ball centered at w with radius ρ. The notation $T: X\rightrightarrows X$ means T is a set-valued mapping/operator from X to X. As usual, Id represents the identity operator.

The paper concerns with *cyclic algorithms* for solving the feasibility problem

$$\text{find a point}\quad x\in\bigcap_{i\in I}C_i. \tag{1}$$

*CARMA, University of Newcastle, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia, and Department of Mathematics and Informatics, Hanoi National University of Education, 136 Xuan Thuy, Hanoi, Vietnam. E-mail: minhdn@hnue.edu.vn

†Department of Mathematical Sciences, Kennedy College of Sciences, University of Massachusetts Lowell, MA 01854, USA. E-mail: hung_phan@uml.edu.

This problem has long been known for its importance in many applications. To describe cyclic algorithms for (1), we first associate each set C_i with an operator $T_i : X \rightrightarrows X$ and adopt the following convention

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N},\ \forall i \in I: \quad C_{mn+i} := C_i \quad \text{and} \quad T_{mn+i} := T_i. \tag{2}$$

Given a starting point $x_0 \in X$, the *cyclic algorithm* with respect to the ordered tuple $(T_i)_{i\in I}$ generates sequences $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ by

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}: \quad x_{n+1} \in T_{n+1}x_n. \tag{3}$$

Each such sequence is called a *cyclic sequence* generated by $(T_i)_{i\in I}$. When $m = 1$, we drop the subscripts and write $C := C_1$ and $T := T_1$. The recurrence (3) then reads as

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}: \quad x_{n+1} \in Tx_n, \tag{4}$$

and we say that the sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is generated by T.

The corresponding operator T_i's include (but not limited to) projections, relaxed-projections, etc. Recall that for a set C, the *distance function* to C is defined by

$$d_C\colon X \to \mathbb{R}\colon x \mapsto \min_{c\in C} \|x - c\|, \tag{5}$$

and the *projector* onto C is defined by

$$P_C\colon X \rightrightarrows \mathbb{R}\colon x \mapsto \operatorname*{argmin}_{c\in C} \|x - c\| = \big\{c \in C \;\big|\; \|x - c\| = d_C(x)\big\}. \tag{6}$$

In general, one expects the cyclic sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ (or other acquired sequences) converges to a solution of (1). In such case, we are interested in R-linear convergence of those sequences. Recall that

Definition 1.1 (R-linear convergence). A sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is said to converge R-linearly to a point $\overline{x}$ if there exist constants $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\rho \in [0, 1[$ such that

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}: \quad \|x_n - \overline{x}\| \leq \sigma\rho^n. \tag{7}$$

Among the main contributions of the paper are the following: Under our basic assumptions that the system $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is *linear regular* (see Definition 2.2) and that each set C_i is *superregular* (see Definition 2.1) around the intersection $C := \bigcap_{i\in I} C_i$, we prove that:

(R1) If one set is injectable (for example, an obtuse cone), then the reflection-projection algorithm [7] converges locally with linear rate. If in addition, all other sets C_i's are convex, then the convergence is global (see Theorem 5.11 and Remark 5.13).

(R2) If all sets are injectable, then the cyclic semi-intrepid projections (Section 5.2) converges locally with linear rate (see Theorem 5.20).

(R3) The cyclic relaxed-projections converges locally with linear rate (see Theorem 5.10).

To the best of our knowledge, (R1) and (R2) are *new* and have never been observed in the literature; while (R3) provided a *refined* R-linear rate for cyclic projections (see Remark 5.9). In addition, we also present other new results involving Douglas–Rachford (DR) operators. Our results complement other studies on projection algorithms [3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20].

The paper is organized as follows. First, Section 2 contains basic concepts needed for our analysis. Section 3 then provides key components for R-linear convergence. In Section 4, we prove R-linear convergence for general cyclic algorithms. Finally, Section 5 presents applications to various cyclic algorithms including the cyclic relaxed projections, cyclic semi-intrepid projections, cyclic and cyclic anchored DR algorithms.

2 Preliminaries

Given a subset C of X and $x \in C$, the proximal normal cone [21, Example 6.16] of C at x is defined by

$$N_C^{\rm prox}(x) := \big\{\lambda(z-x) \;\big|\; z \in P_C^{-1}(x),\ \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+\big\} \tag{8}$$

and the Mordukhovich/limiting normal cone [18] of C at x is

$$N_C(x) := \big\{u := \lim_{n\to\infty} u_n \;\big|\; u_n \in N_C^{\rm prox}(x_n), x_n \in C, x_n \to x\big\}. \tag{9}$$

As seen below, normal cones are used to described superregularity for sets and strong regularity for systems of sets. We recall the superregularity concept, which was first introduced in [16] and later refined in [8, 9, 14, 19]. Superregularity holds for a major class of sets, including but not limited to, convex sets, sets with "smooth" boundary. This property plays an important role in the linear convergence of projection methods, see, e.g., [8, 9, 14, 16, 19, 20].

Definition 2.1 (superregularity of sets). Let $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and let $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. We say that C is (ε,δ)-*regular* at $w \in X$ if

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} x, y \in C \cap I\!B_\delta(w), \\ u \in N_C^{\rm prox}(x) \end{array}\right\} \;\Rightarrow\; \langle u, x-y\rangle \geq -\varepsilon\|u\|\cdot\|x-y\|, \tag{10}$$

The set C is said to be *superregular* at a point w if for every $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, there exists $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that C is (ε,δ)-regular at w. The system $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is said to be *superregular* at w if C_i is superregular at w for every $i \in I$.

Definition 2.2 (linear regularity of set systems). Let $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The system $\{C_i\}_{\in I}$ is said to be κ-*linearly regular* on $U \subseteq X$ if

$$(\forall x \in U)\quad d_C(x) \leq \kappa \max_{i\in I} d_{C_i}(x), \quad \text{where} \quad C := \bigcap_{i\in I} C_i. \tag{11}$$

We say that $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is *linearly regular* around $w \in X$ if there exist $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ and $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is κ-linearly regular on $I\!B_\delta(w)$.

Definition 2.3 (strong regularity of set systems). The system $\{C_i\}_{\in I}$ is said to be *strongly regular* at $w \in \bigcap_{i\in I} C_i$ (see [15, Definition 1, Proposition 10, and Corollary 2]) if the following normal cone constraint qualification at $w \in \bigcap_{i\in I} C_i$ holds

$$\sum_{i\in I} x_i^* = 0, \quad \text{where} \quad x_i^* \in N_{C_i}(w) \quad \Rightarrow \quad (\forall i \in I)\ x_i^* = 0. \tag{12}$$

In the case $m = 2$, this can be written as

$$N_{C_1}(w) \cap (-N_{C_2}(w)) = \{0\}. \tag{13}$$

Remark 2.4. It follows from the definition that if $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is strongly regular at $w \in \bigcap_{i\in I} C_i$, then $\{C_j\}_{j\in J}$ is also strongly regular at w for all nonempty subset J of I.

Fact 2.5. *([15, Theorem 1]) If the system $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is strongly regular at $w \in \bigcap_{i\in I} C_i$, then it is linearly regular around w.*

3 Quasi Fejér monotonicity and quasi coerciveness

The following Fejér monotonicity for operators is a generalization of Fejér monotonicity for sequences in [2, Definition 5.1].

Definition 3.1 (quasi firm Fejér monotonicity). Let C be a nonempty subset of X, let $\gamma \in [1, +\infty[$, and let $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+$. A set-valued operator $T\colon X \rightrightarrows X$ is called (C, γ, β)-*quasi firmly Fejér monotone* on U if

$$\forall x \in U,\ \forall x_+ \in Tx,\ \forall \overline{x} \in C: \quad \|x_+ - \overline{x}\|^2 + \beta\|x - x_+\|^2 \le \gamma\|x - \overline{x}\|^2. \tag{14}$$

We say that T is (C, γ)-*quasi firmly Fejér monotone* on U if $\beta = 1$, i.e.,

$$\forall x \in U,\ \forall x_+ \in Tx,\ \forall \overline{x} \in C: \quad \|x_+ - \overline{x}\|^2 + \|x - x_+\|^2 \le \gamma\|x - \overline{x}\|^2. \tag{15}$$

We say that T is (C, γ)-*quasi Fejér monotone* on U if $\beta = 0$, i.e.,

$$\forall x \in U,\ \forall x_+ \in Tx,\ \forall \overline{x} \in C: \quad \|x_+ - \overline{x}\| \le \gamma^{1/2}\|x - \overline{x}\|. \tag{16}$$

From the definition, we observe that

(i) If $\gamma' \ge \gamma$ and $\beta' \le \beta$, then (C, γ, β)-quasi firm Fejér monotonicity implies (C, γ', β')-quasi firm Fejér monotonicity.

(ii) If $C \subseteq \operatorname{Fix} T$ and T is firmly nonexpansive (see [2, Definition 4.1]), then T is $(C, 1)$-quasi firm Fejér monotone.

(iii) If $C \subseteq \operatorname{Fix} T$ and T is nonexpansive, then T is $(C, 1)$-quasi Fejér monotone.

(iv) (C,γ)-quasi firm Fejér monotonicity is, indeed, a stronger version of [20, Definition 2.7]. The latter one requires only

$$\forall x \in U,\ \forall x_+ \in Tx,\ \forall \overline{x} \in P_C x: \quad \|x_+ - \overline{x}\|^2 + \|x - x_+\|^2 \leq \gamma \|x - \overline{x}\|^2. \tag{17}$$

Nevertheless, it turns out that (C,γ)-quasi firm Fejér monotonicity still holds for a broad class of projections, e.g., relaxed projections onto superregular sets (see Lemma 3.5).

The next lemma justifies quasi Fejér monotonicity for averaged operators.

Lemma 3.2. *Let C be a nonempty subset of X, let $\gamma \in [1,+\infty[$, let $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_+$, let $\lambda \in]0, 1+\beta]$, and let $S\colon X \rightrightarrows X$ be a (C,γ,β)-quasi firmly Fejér monotone operator on U. Then $T := (1-\lambda)\operatorname{Id} + \lambda S$ is (C,γ',β')-quasi firmly Fejér monotone on U with*

$$\gamma' := 1 - \lambda + \lambda\gamma \quad \text{and} \quad \beta' := \frac{1-\lambda+\beta}{\lambda}. \tag{18}$$

Proof. Let $x \in U$, let $x_+ \in Tx$, let $\overline{x} \in C$. Writing $x_+ = (1-\lambda)x + \lambda s$ with $s \in Sx$, we have $x_+ - \overline{x} = (1-\lambda)(x-\overline{x}) + \lambda(s-\overline{x})$ and $x - x_+ = \lambda(x-s)$, so

$$\|x_+ - \overline{x}\|^2 = (1-\lambda)\|x-\overline{x}\|^2 + \lambda\|s-\overline{x}\|^2 - \lambda(1-\lambda)\|(x-\overline{x}) - (s-\overline{x})\|^2 \tag{19a}$$
$$= (1-\lambda)\|x-\overline{x}\|^2 + \lambda\|s-\overline{x}\|^2 - \lambda(1-\lambda)\|x-s\|^2. \tag{19b}$$

Using the (C,γ,β)-quasi firmly Fejér monotoneness of S on U, we continue (19) as

$$\|x_+ - \overline{x}\|^2 \leq (1-\lambda)\|x-\overline{x}\|^2 + \lambda\Big(\gamma\|x-\overline{x}\|^2 - \beta\|x-s\|^2\Big) - \lambda(1-\lambda)\|x-s\|^2 \tag{20a}$$
$$= (1-\lambda+\lambda\gamma)\|x-\overline{x}\|^2 - \lambda(1-\lambda+\beta)\|x-s\|^2 \tag{20b}$$
$$= (1-\lambda+\lambda\gamma)\|x-\overline{x}\|^2 - \frac{1-\lambda+\beta}{\lambda}\|x-x_+\|^2, \tag{20c}$$

which completes the proof. ■

Definition 3.3 (quasi coerciveness). Let C be a nonempty closed subset of X, and let $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. An operator $T\colon X \rightrightarrows X$ is called (C,ν)-*quasi coercive* on U if

$$\forall x \in U,\ \forall x_+ \in Tx: \quad \|x - x_+\| \geq \nu d_C(x). \tag{21}$$

We say that T is C-*quasi coercive* around $w \in X$ if there exist $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that T is (C,ν)-quasi coercive on $\mathbb{B}_\delta(w)$.

Obviously, if T is (C,ν)-quasi coercive and $\nu > \nu'$ then T is also (C,ν')-quasi coercive. Quasi coerciveness is closely related to the *linear regularity* in [10, Definition 2.1]. Indeed, when $C = \operatorname{Fix} T \neq \varnothing$, then T is (C,ν)-quasi coercive on X if and only if it is linearly regular with constant $\frac{1}{\nu}$ in the sense of [10, Definition 2.1]. Again, under certain conditions, we will show that quasi coerciveness holds for several class of projections.

3.1 Relaxed projectors

In this section, we justify the quasi Fejér monotonicity and quasi coerciveness of relaxed projectors on superregular sets. Let C be a nonempty closed subset of X, and let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The relaxed projector with parameter λ is defined by

$$P_C^\lambda := (1-\lambda)\,\mathrm{Id} + \lambda P_C. \tag{22}$$

Clearly, $P_C^0 = \mathrm{Id}$, $P_C^1 = P_C$ and $P_C^2 = R_C := 2P_C - \mathrm{Id}$ (the *reflector* across C). The following lemma will be used several times in our analysis.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $w \in C$, let $\gamma \in [1, +\infty[$, let $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. Then the following hold:*

(i) *For all $x \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$, $P_C^\lambda x \subseteq \mathbb{B}_{(1+\lambda)\delta/2}(w)$. In particular, $P_C(\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)) \subseteq C \cap \mathbb{B}_\delta(w)$.*

(ii) *If $T\colon X \rightrightarrows X$ is $(C \cap \mathbb{B}_\delta(w), \gamma)$-quasi Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$, then*

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w): \quad Tx \subseteq \mathbb{B}_{\gamma^{1/2}\delta/2}(w), \tag{23a}$$

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w),\ \forall x_+ \in Tx: \quad d_C(x_+) \leq \gamma^{1/2} d_C(x). \tag{23b}$$

Proof. (i): Let $x \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$, and let $x_+ \in P_C^\lambda x$. Writing $x_+ = (1-\lambda)x + \lambda p$ for some $p \in P_C x$, and noting that $w \in C$, we have $\|x_+ - x\| = \lambda\|p - x\| = \lambda d_C(x) \leq \lambda\|x - w\|$, and so

$$\|x_+ - w\| \leq \|x_+ - x\| + \|x - w\| \leq (1+\lambda)\|x - w\| \leq (1+\lambda)\delta/2. \tag{24}$$

Therefore, $P_C^\lambda x \subseteq C \cap \mathbb{B}_{(1+\lambda)\delta/2}(w)$.

(ii): Let $x \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w) \subseteq \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$, and let $x_+ \in Tx$. By quasi Fejér monotonicity of T (see Definition 3.1),

$$\forall \overline{x} \in C \cap \mathbb{B}_\delta(w): \quad \|x_+ - \overline{x}\| \leq \gamma^{1/2}\|x - \overline{x}\|. \tag{25}$$

Setting $\overline{x} = w$, we have $\|x_+ - w\| \leq \gamma^{1/2}\|x - w\| \leq \frac{\gamma^{1/2}\delta}{2}$. This implies $Tx \subseteq \mathbb{B}_{\gamma^{1/2}\delta/2}(w)$. Now let $p \in P_C x$, then $x \in C \cap \mathbb{B}_\delta(w)$ by (i). Applying (25) to $\overline{x} = p$, we have

$$d_C(x_+) \leq \|x_+ - p\| \leq \gamma^{1/2}\|x - p\| = \gamma^{1/2} d_C(x). \tag{26}$$

Lemma 3.5 (quasi firm Fejér monotonicity of relaxed projectors). *Let $w \in C$, $\varepsilon \in [0, 1[$, $\lambda \in [0, 2]$, and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. Define*

$$\Omega := C \cap \mathbb{B}_\delta(w) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma := 1 + \frac{\lambda\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}. \tag{27}$$

Suppose further that C is (ε, δ)-regular at w. Then P_C^λ is $(\Omega, \gamma, \frac{2-\lambda}{\lambda})$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$, i.e.,

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w),\ \forall x_+ \in P_C^\lambda x,\ \forall \overline{x} \in \Omega: \tag{28a}$$

$$\|x_+ - \overline{x}\|^2 + \frac{2-\lambda}{\lambda}\|x - x_+\|^2 \leq \gamma\|x - \overline{x}\|^2. \tag{28b}$$

In particular, $R_C = P_C^2$ is $(\Omega, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon})$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$. Additionally, if $\varepsilon \in [0, 1/3]$, then

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w): \quad P_C^\lambda x \subseteq \mathbb{B}_{\delta/\sqrt{2}}(w). \tag{29}$$

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$ and let $p \in P_C x$. Then $p \in C \cap \mathbb{B}_\delta(w) = \Omega$ by Lemma 3.4(i). Since C is (ε, δ)-regular at w and $x - p \in N_C^{\mathrm{prox}}(p)$, we have

$$\langle x - p, p - \overline{x}\rangle \geq -\varepsilon\|x - p\| \cdot \|p - \overline{x}\| \geq -\tfrac{\varepsilon}{2}\left(\|x - p\|^2 + \|p - \overline{x}\|^2\right). \tag{30}$$

It then follows that

$$\|x - \overline{x}\|^2 = \|x - p\|^2 + \|p - \overline{x}\|^2 + 2\langle x - p, p - \overline{x}\rangle \tag{31a}$$

$$\geq \|x - p\|^2 + \|p - \overline{x}\|^2 - \varepsilon\left(\|x - p\|^2 + \|p - \overline{x}\|^2\right) \tag{31b}$$

$$= (1 - \varepsilon)\left(\|x - p\|^2 + \|p - \overline{x}\|^2\right). \tag{31c}$$

So

$$\tfrac{1}{1-\varepsilon}\|x - \overline{x}\|^2 \geq \|x - p\|^2 + \|p - \overline{x}\|^2, \tag{32}$$

i.e., P_C is $(\Omega, \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}, 1)$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$. Now by Lemma 3.2, we conclude that $P_C^\lambda = (1 - \lambda)\,\mathrm{Id} + \lambda P_C$ is (Ω, γ, β)-quasi firmly Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$, where

$$\gamma := 1 - \lambda + \frac{\lambda}{1 - \varepsilon} = 1 + \frac{\lambda\varepsilon}{1 - \varepsilon} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta := \frac{1 - \lambda + 1}{\lambda}. \tag{33}$$

Next assume that $\varepsilon \in [0, 1/3]$. Then $\gamma = 1 - \lambda + \frac{\lambda}{1-\varepsilon} \leq 1 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \leq 2$. By quasi Fejér monotonicity and Lemma 3.4(ii), $P_C^\lambda x \subseteq \mathbb{B}_{\gamma^{1/2}\delta/2}(w) \subseteq \mathbb{B}_{\delta/\sqrt{2}}(w)$. ■

Lemma 3.6 (quasi coerciveness of relaxed projectors). *If $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, then P_C^λ is (C, λ)-quasi coercive on X.*

Proof. Let $x \in X$, and let $x_+ \in P_C^\lambda x$. Then $x_+ = (1 - \lambda)x + \lambda p$ with $p \in P_C x$, and so

$$\|x - x_+\| = \lambda\|x - p\| = \lambda d_C(x). \tag{34}$$

■

3.2 Generalized Douglas–Rachford Operators

In this section, we justify the quasi firm Fejér monotonicity of generalized Douglas–Rachford operators. Let A and B be closed subsets of X such that $A \cap B \neq \varnothing$, and let $\lambda, \mu, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The *generalized Douglas–Rachford operator* is defined by

$$T_{\lambda,\mu}^\alpha := (1 - \alpha)\,\mathrm{Id} + \alpha P_B^\mu P_A^\lambda \tag{35}$$

When $\lambda = \mu = 2$, $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$, $T_{2,2}^{1/2} = \frac{1}{2}(\mathrm{Id} + R_B R_A)$ is the classic Douglas–Rachford operator.

Lemma 3.7 (quasi firm Fejér monotonicity of generalized DR operators). *Let $w \in A \cap B$, $\varepsilon_1 \in [0, 1/3]$, $\varepsilon_2 \in [0, 1[$, and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. Suppose that A and B are (ε_1, δ)- and $(\varepsilon_2, \sqrt{2}\delta)$-regular at w, respectively. Then $T^{\alpha}_{\lambda,\mu}$, with $\lambda, \mu \in [0, 2]$ and $\alpha \in]0, 1]$, is $(A \cap B \cap \mathbb{B}_{\delta}(w), \gamma, \beta)$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$ where*

$$\gamma := 1 - \alpha + \alpha \left(1 + \frac{\lambda\varepsilon_1}{1-\varepsilon_1}\right)\left(1 + \frac{\mu\varepsilon_2}{1-\varepsilon_2}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta := \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}. \tag{36}$$

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$, let $r \in P^{\lambda}_{A}x$, let $s \in P^{\mu}_{B}r$, and let $\overline{x} \in A \cap B \cap \mathbb{B}_{\delta}(w)$. Then Lemma 3.5 applied to P^{λ}_{A} implies

$$\|r - \overline{x}\| \leq \gamma_1^{1/2}\|x - \overline{x}\|, \quad \text{where} \quad \gamma_1 := 1 + \frac{\lambda\varepsilon_1}{1-\varepsilon_1}, \tag{37}$$

and also $r \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/\sqrt{2}}(w)$. So Lemma 3.5 applied to P^{μ}_{B} yields

$$\|s - \overline{x}\| \leq \gamma_2^{1/2}\|r - \overline{x}\| \leq (\gamma_1\gamma_2)^{1/2}\|x - \overline{x}\|, \tag{38}$$

where $\gamma_2 := 1 + \frac{\mu\varepsilon_2}{1-\varepsilon_2}$. This proves $P^{\mu}_{B}P^{\lambda}_{A}$ is $(A \cap B \cap \mathbb{B}_{\delta}(w), \gamma_1\gamma_2)$-quasi Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$. Now apply Lemma 3.2 to the operators $P^{\mu}_{B}P^{\lambda}_{A}$ and

$$T^{\alpha}_{\lambda,\mu} = (1-\alpha)\,\mathrm{Id} + \alpha P^{\mu}_{B}P^{\lambda}_{A}. \tag{39}$$

■

Lemma 3.8 (quasi coerciveness of generalized DR operators). *Let $w \in A \cap B$, let $\varepsilon \in [0, 1/3]$, and let $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. Suppose that A is (ε, δ)-regular at w, and that $\{A, B\}$ is strongly regular at w. Then whenever $\lambda, \mu \in]0, 2]$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, $T^{\alpha}_{\lambda,\mu}$ is $(A \cap B)$-quasi coercive around w.*

Proof. Since $\{A, B\}$ is strongly regular at w, we have by [20, Lemmas 2.3 and 4.1] that

$$\overline{\theta} := \sup\left\{\langle u, v\rangle \;\middle|\; u \in N_A(w) \cap \mathbb{B}_1(0), v \in -N_B(w) \cap \mathbb{B}_1(0)\right\} < 1. \tag{40}$$

Let $\theta \in \left]\overline{\theta}, 1\right[$. Combining with Fact 2.5 and shrinking δ if necessary, we can assume that

(i) A is (ε, δ)-regular at w,

(ii) There exists $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that for all $x \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$, $d_{A\cap B}(x) \leq \kappa \max\{d_A(x), d_B(x)\}$,

(iii) Whenever $\begin{cases} a \in A \cap \mathbb{B}_{\delta}(w),\ b \in B \cap \mathbb{B}_{\sqrt{2}\delta}(w), \\ u \in N^{\mathrm{prox}}_{A}(a),\ v \in N^{\mathrm{prox}}_{B}(b) \end{cases}$, we have $\langle u, v\rangle \geq -\theta\|u\|\|v\|$.

Let $x \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$ and $x_+ \in T^{\alpha}_{\lambda,\mu}x$. By definition, there exists

$$\begin{cases} a \in P_A x \quad , \quad r = (1-\lambda)x + \lambda a \in P^{\lambda}_{A}x, & \text{(41a)} \\ b \in P_B r \quad , \quad s = (1-\mu)r + \mu b \in P^{\mu}_{B}r, & \text{(41b)} \end{cases}$$

such that $x_+ = (1-\alpha)x + \alpha s$. Then

$$x - x_+ = \alpha(x-s), \quad x - r = \lambda(x-a), \quad \text{and} \quad r - s = \mu(r-b). \tag{42}$$

By Lemma 3.4, that $x \in I\!B_{\delta/2}(w)$ and that $a \in P_A x$ imply $a \in A \cap I\!B_\delta(w)$. Since $\varepsilon \in [0, 1/3]$, Lemma 3.5 implies $r \in I\!B_{\sqrt{2}\delta/2}(w)$. Since $b \in P_B r$, using again Lemma 3.4, we get $b \in B \cap I\!B_{\sqrt{2}\delta}(w)$. Now as $x - r = \lambda(x-a) \in N_A^{\text{prox}}(a)$ and $r - s = \mu(r-b) \in N_B^{\text{prox}}(b)$, assumption (iii) and Cauchy inequality give

$$2\langle x - r, r - s\rangle \geq -2\theta\|x-r\|\|r-s\| \geq -\theta(\|x-r\|^2 + \|r-s\|^2). \tag{43}$$

So

$$\|x - x_+\|^2 = \alpha^2\|x-s\|^2 = \alpha^2(\|x-r\|^2 + \|r-s\|^2 + 2\langle x-r, r-s\rangle) \tag{44a}$$
$$\geq (1-\theta)\alpha^2(\|x-r\|^2 + \|r-s\|^2). \tag{44b}$$

Furthermore,

$$\|x-r\|^2 = \lambda^2\|x-a\|^2 = \lambda^2 d_A^2(x), \tag{45}$$

and by Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$(\mu^2+1)(\|x-r\|^2 + \|r-s\|^2) \geq (\mu\|x-r\| + \|r-s\|)^2 \tag{46a}$$
$$= (\mu\|x-r\| + \mu\|r-b\|)^2 \tag{46b}$$
$$\geq (\mu\|x-b\|)^2 \geq \mu^2 d_B^2(x). \tag{46c}$$

Combining (44), (45), and (46), we obtain

$$\|x - x_+\| \geq \alpha\sqrt{1-\theta}\min\left\{\lambda, \tfrac{\mu}{\sqrt{1+\mu^2}}\right\}\max\{d_A(x), d_B(x)\} \tag{47a}$$
$$\geq \frac{\alpha\sqrt{1-\theta}}{\kappa}\min\left\{\lambda, \tfrac{\mu}{\sqrt{1+\mu^2}}\right\} d_{A\cap B}(x) =: \nu d_{A\cap B}(x), \tag{47b}$$

where $\nu := \frac{\alpha\sqrt{1-\theta}}{\kappa}\min\left\{\lambda, \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{1+\mu^2}}\right\}$. ■

4 Linear convergence of cyclic algorithms

We start with an elementary linear convergence result.

Lemma 4.1. *Let C be a closed subset of X, let $w \in C$, and let $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in X. Suppose that one of the following assumptions holds:*

(i) *There exist $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, $\rho \in [0,1[$, and $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that*

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}: \quad x_n \in I\!B_\delta(w) \;\Rightarrow\; d_C(x_{n+1}) \leq \rho d_C(x_n) \text{ and } \|x_{n+1} - x_n\| \leq \sigma d_C(x_n). \tag{48}$$

(ii) *The sequence* $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *is generated by an operator* $T\colon X \rightrightarrows X$, *and there exist* $\delta, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ *and* $\rho \in [0,1[$ *such that*

$$\forall x \in I\!B_\delta(w),\ \forall x_+ \in Tx: \quad d_C(x_+) \le \rho d_C(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \|x_+ - x\| \le \sigma d_C(x). \tag{49}$$

Then whenever $\|x_0 - w\| \le \frac{\delta(1-\rho)}{\sigma+1-\rho}$, *we have*

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}: \quad \|x_n - w\| \le \delta, \tag{50}$$

and there exists $\overline{x} \in C \cap I\!B_\delta(w)$ *such that*

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}: \quad \|x_n - \overline{x}\| \le \frac{\sigma d_C(x_0)}{1-\rho}\rho^n, \tag{51}$$

i.e., the sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *converges* R-linearly *to a point in* C *with rate* ρ.

Proof. Suppose assumption (i) holds and that $\|x_0 - w\| \le \frac{\delta(1-\rho)}{\sigma+1-\rho} \le \delta$. So (50) holds for $n = 0$. Suppose (50) holds for $0, 1, \ldots, n-1$, we shall prove that it also holds for n. Indeed, the induction hypothesis and (48) yield

$$\forall i \in \{0,1,\ldots,n-1\}: \quad d_C(x_{i+1}) \le \rho d_C(x_i) \text{ and } \|x_{i+1} - x_i\| \le \sigma d_C(x_i). \tag{52}$$

Noting that $d_C(x_0) \le \|x_0 - w\|$, we obtain

$$\|x_n - w\| \le \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \|x_{i+1} - x_i\| + \|x_0 - w\| \le \sigma \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} d_C(x_i) + \|x_0 - w\| \tag{53a}$$

$$\le \sigma \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \rho^i d_C(x_0) + \|x_0 - w\| \le \big(\sigma \frac{1}{1-\rho} + 1\big)\|x_0 - w\| \le \delta. \tag{53b}$$

Hence, (50) holds for n. By mathematical induction principle, (50) holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Now it follows from (48) and (50) that

$$(\forall n \in \mathbb{N}) \quad d_C(x_{n+1}) \le \rho d_C(x_n) \text{ and } \|x_{n+1} - x_n\| \le \sigma d_C(x_n), \tag{54}$$

For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, take $x_n^* \in P_C x_n$. On the one hand,

$$\|x_n - x_n^*\| = d_C(x_n) \le \rho^n d(x_0) \to 0, \text{ as } n \to +\infty. \tag{55}$$

On the other hand, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N} \smallsetminus \{0\}$, we have

$$\|x_n - x_{n+k}\| \le \sum_{i=n}^{n+k-1} \|x_{i+1} - x_i\| \le \sum_{i=n}^{n+k-1} \sigma\rho^i d(x_0) \le \frac{\sigma d_C(x_0)}{1-\rho}\rho^n \to 0, \text{ as } n \to +\infty. \tag{56}$$

Therefore, $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(x_n^*)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ both converge to the same limit $\overline{x} \in C \cap I\!B_\delta(w)$. We then obtain (51) by leting $k \to +\infty$ in (56).

Finally, if (ii) holds, then clearly (i) also holds for $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. So, the conclusion follows. ■

Corollary 4.2 ([20, Proposition 2.11]). *Let $T\colon X \rightrightarrows X$ be an operator, let C be a closed subset of X, let $w \in C$, and let $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence generated by T. Suppose that there exist $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ and $\rho \in [0,1[$ such that*

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{B}_\delta(w),\ \forall x_+ \in Tx,\ \forall \overline{x} \in P_C x: \quad \|x_+ - \overline{x}\| \leq \rho\|x - \overline{x}\|. \tag{57}$$

Then whenever $\|x_0 - w\| \leq \frac{\delta(1-\rho)}{2}$, there exists $\overline{x} \in C \cap \mathbb{B}_\delta(w)$ such that

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}: \quad \|x_n - \overline{x}\| \leq \frac{(1+\rho)\|x_0 - w\|}{1-\rho}\rho^n, \tag{58}$$

*i.e., the sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges R-*linearly *to a point in C with rate ρ.*

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbb{B}_\delta(w)$, let $x_+ \in Tx$, and let $\overline{x} \in P_C x$. By assumption,

$$d_C(x_+) \leq \|x_+ - \overline{x}\| \leq \rho\|x - \overline{x}\| = \rho d_C(x), \tag{59}$$

and also

$$\|x_+ - x\| \leq \|x_+ - \overline{x}\| + \|x - \overline{x}\| \leq (1+\rho)\|x - \overline{x}\| = (1+\rho)d_C(x). \tag{60}$$

Now apply Lemma 4.1(ii) to $\sigma = 1 + \rho$ and note that $d_C(x_0) \leq \|x_0 - w\|$. ■

The following result proves that if distance to the feasible set is reduced at least by a factor $\rho \in [0,1[$ after every *fixed number* of steps, then R-linear convergence is achieved.

Lemma 4.3 (linear reduction after k steps). *Let C be a closed subset of X, let $w \in C$, and Let $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in X. Let also $\delta_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, $k \in \mathbb{N} \smallsetminus \{0\}$, $\rho \in [0,1[$, $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and suppose that for every tuple $(z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_k) := (x_{kn}, x_{kn+1}, \ldots, x_{kn+k})$ with $\|z_0 - w\| \leq \delta_0$, we have*

$$d_C(z_k) \leq \rho d_C(z_0) \quad \textit{and} \tag{61a}$$

$$\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, k\},\ \forall p \in C \cap \mathbb{B}_{2\delta_0}(w): \quad \|z_i - p\| \leq \Gamma\|z_0 - p\|. \tag{61b}$$

Then whenever $\|x_0 - w\| \leq \frac{\delta_0(1-\rho)}{2+\Gamma-\rho}$, we have $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges R-linearly to a point in $\mathbb{B}_\delta(w)$. More specifically, there exists $\overline{x} \in C \cap \mathbb{B}_{\delta_0}(w)$ such that

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}: \quad \|x_n - \overline{x}\| \leq \frac{\Gamma(1+\Gamma)d_C(x_0)}{1-\rho}\rho^{\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \rfloor}. \tag{62}$$

Proof. Consider the sequence $(y_n := x_{kn})_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. Suppose $\|y_n - w\| \leq \delta$. Then (61a) means $d_C(y_{n+1}) \leq \rho d_C(y_n)$. Take $p \in P_C x_{kn} = P_C y_n \subset P_C(\mathbb{B}_{\delta_0}(w)) \subseteq C \cap \mathbb{B}_{2\delta_0}(w)$ (see Lemma 3.4). So (61b) implies

$$\|y_{n+1} - y_n\| \leq \|y_{n+1} - p\| + \|y_n - p\| \leq \Gamma d_C(y_n) + d_C(y_n) = (1+\Gamma)d_C(y_n). \tag{63}$$

So, Lemma 4.1 implies whenever $\|y_0 - w\| \leq \frac{\delta(1-\rho)}{2+\Gamma-\rho}$, the sequence $(y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges R-linearly to some $\overline{x} \in C \cap \mathbb{B}_{\delta_0}(w)$

$$\|y_n - \overline{x}\| \leq \frac{(1+\Gamma)d_C(y_0)}{1-\rho}\rho^n = \frac{(1+\Gamma)d_C(x_0)}{1-\rho}\rho^n. \tag{64}$$

Now (61b) implies for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$,

$$\|x_{kn+i} - \overline{x}\| \leq \Gamma\|x_{kn} - \overline{x}\| = \Gamma\|y_n - \overline{x}\| \leq \frac{\Gamma(1+\Gamma)d_C(x_0)}{1-\rho}\rho^n. \tag{65}$$

Replacing $kn + i$ by n, we obtain

$$\|x_n - \overline{x}\| \leq \frac{\Gamma(1+\Gamma)d_C(x_0)}{1-\rho}\rho^{\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \rfloor}. \tag{66}$$

■

The following lemma analyzes the performance of m steps of cyclic algorithms for quasi and quasi firmly Fejér monotone operators.

Lemma 4.4 (consecutive steps of cyclic algorithms). *Let $\delta, \beta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, $\nu \in]0, 1]$, and $\gamma_i \in [1, +\infty[$ for all $i \in I$. Let $w \in C := \bigcap_{i\in I} C_i$ and $\Omega := C \cap \mathbb{B}_\delta(w)$. Let $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_m$ be $m+1$ consecutive points of the cyclic algorithm with respect to $(T_i)_{i\in I}$, where*

$$\|x_0 - w\| \leq \delta_0 := (\gamma_1\gamma_2\cdots\gamma_{m-1})^{-\frac{1}{2}}\frac{\delta}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \forall i \in I: \ x_i \in T_i x_{i-1}. \tag{67}$$

The following statements hold:

(i) *If for every $i \in I$, T_i is (Ω, γ_i)-quasi Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$, then*

$$\forall i \in I \smallsetminus \{m\}: \quad \|x_i - w\| \leq (\gamma_1\cdots\gamma_i)^{1/2}\delta_0 \leq \frac{\delta}{2}, \tag{68a}$$

$$\forall i \in I, \ \forall p \in \Omega: \quad \|x_i - p\| \leq \gamma_i^{1/2}\|x_{i-1} - p\|. \tag{68b}$$

(ii) *If for every $i \in I$, T_i is $(\Omega, \gamma_i, \beta)$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone and (C_i, ν)-quasi coercive on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$, then*

$$\forall p \in \Omega: \quad \|x_m - p\|^2 \leq (\gamma_1\cdots\gamma_m)\|x_0 - p\|^2 - \frac{\beta\nu^2}{m}\max_{i\in I} d^2_{C_i}(x_0). \tag{69}$$

Proof. (i): First, we have $\|x_0 - w\| \leq \delta_0 = (\gamma_1\cdots\gamma_{m-1})^{-\frac{1}{2}}\frac{\delta}{2} \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$ since $\gamma_i \geq 1$. Since T_1 is (Ω, γ_i)-quasi Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$, we have for every $p \in \Omega$

$$\|x_1 - p\| \leq \gamma_1^{1/2}\|x_0 - p\|. \tag{70}$$

In particular, taking $p = w$ yields

$$\|x_1 - w\| \leq \gamma_1^{1/2}\|x_0 - w\| \leq \gamma_1^{1/2}\delta_0 = (\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_{m-1})^{-\frac{1}{2}}\frac{\delta}{2} \leq \frac{\delta}{2}. \tag{71}$$

Repeating the argument for $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{m-1}$, we get the conclusion.

(ii): Clearly, quasi firm Fejér monotonicity implies quasi Fejér monotonicity, so (68a) holds. That means, $x_0, x_1, \ldots, x_{m-1} \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$. Since each T_i is quasi firm Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$, we have

$$\|x_1 - p\|^2 + \beta\|x_0 - x_1\|^2 \leq \gamma_1\|x_0 - p\|^2, \tag{72a}$$
$$\|x_2 - p\|^2 + \beta\|x_1 - x_2\|^2 \leq \gamma_2\|x_1 - p\|^2, \tag{72b}$$
$$\vdots \tag{72c}$$
$$\|x_m - p\|^2 + \beta\|x_{m-1} - x_m\|^2 \leq \gamma_m\|x_{m-1} - p\|^2. \tag{72d}$$

So,

$$\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_m\|x_1 - p\|^2 + \gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_m\beta\|x_0 - x_1\|^2 \leq \gamma_1\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_m\|x_0 - p\|^2, \tag{73a}$$
$$\gamma_3 \cdots \gamma_m\|x_2 - p\|^2 + \gamma_3 \cdots \gamma_m\beta\|x_1 - x_2\|^2 \leq \gamma_2\gamma_3 \cdots \gamma_m\|x_1 - p\|^2, \tag{73b}$$
$$\vdots \tag{73c}$$
$$\gamma_m\|x_{m-1} - p\|^2 + \gamma_m\beta\|x_{m-2} - x_{m-1}\|^2 \leq \gamma_{m-1}\gamma_m\|x_{m-2} - p\|^2, \tag{73d}$$
$$\|x_m - p\|^2 + \beta\|x_{m-1} - x_m\|^2 \leq \gamma_m\|x_{m-1} - p\|^2. \tag{73e}$$

Using telescoping techniques and $\gamma_i \geq 1$, we have

$$(\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_m)\|x_0 - p\|^2 \geq \|x_m - p\|^2 + \beta\sum_{i=1}^{m}\|x_{i-1} - x_i\|^2 \tag{74}$$

Now Cauchy–Schwarz inequality gives us

$$(\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_m)\|x_0 - p\|^2 \geq \|x_m - p\|^2 + \frac{\beta}{m}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m}\|x_{i-1} - x_i\|\right)^2. \tag{75}$$

Let $i \in I$. Since T_i is (C_i, ν_i)-quasi coercive on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$, we have $\|x_{i-1} - x_i\| \geq \nu d_{C_i}(x_{i-1})$. So,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m}\|x_{i-1} - x_i\| \geq \|x_0 - x_{i-1}\| + \|x_{i-1} - x_i\| \tag{76a}$$
$$\geq \|x_0 - x_{i-1}\| + \nu d_{C_i}(x_{i-1}) \tag{76b}$$
$$\geq \nu\Big(\|x_0 - x_{i-1}\| + d_{C_i}(x_{i-1})\Big) \geq \nu d_{C_i}(x_0). \tag{76c}$$

This means

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m}\|x_{i-1} - x_i\| \geq \nu\max_{i\in I} d_{C_i}(x_0). \tag{77}$$

Combining with (75), we obtain (69). ■

The following theorems are cornerstones in our convergence analysis. In the sequel, we denote $[\rho]_+ := \max\{0, \rho\}$ for $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 4.5 (cyclic sequence of quasi firmly Fejér monotone operators). *Let $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ and $\gamma_i \in [1, +\infty[$ for all $i \in I$. Let $w \in C := \bigcap_{i\in I} C_i$ and $\Omega := C \cap \mathbb{B}_\delta(w)$. Let $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a cyclic sequence generated by $(T_i)_{i\in I}$. Suppose that*

(i) *$\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is κ-linearly regular on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$ for some $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$.*

(ii) *There are $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ and $\nu \in]0, 1]$ such that for all $i \in I$, T_i is $(\Omega, \gamma_i, \beta)$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone and (C_i, ν)-quasi coercive on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$.*

Then whenever $\|x_0 - w\| \le (\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{m-1})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\delta}{2}$, we have

$$d_C(x_m) \le \left[\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_m - \frac{\beta\nu^2}{m\kappa^2}\right]_+^{1/2} d_C(x_0). \tag{78}$$

Consequently, if $\rho := \left[\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_m - \frac{\beta\nu^2}{m\kappa^2}\right]_+^{1/2} < 1$ and x_0 is sufficiently close to w, then $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges R-linearly to some point $\overline{x} \in C$ with rate at most $\rho^{1/m}$.

Proof. Suppose $\|x_0 - w\| \le \delta_0 := (\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{m-1})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\delta}{2}$. Since T_i is quasi Fejér monotone with respect to Ω and $\mathbb{B}_{2\delta_0}(w) \subseteq \Omega$, we use (68b) in Lemma 4.4(i) to obtain

$$\forall i \in I,\ \forall p \in C \cap \mathbb{B}_{2\delta_0}(w): \tag{79a}$$

$$\|x_i - p\| \le (\gamma_i)^{1/2}\|x_{i-1} - p\| \le (\gamma_i\gamma_{i-1})^{1/2}\|x_{i-2} - p\| \tag{79b}$$

$$\le \cdots \tag{79c}$$

$$\le (\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{m-1})^{1/2}\|x_0 - p\| =: \Gamma\|x_0 - p\|. \tag{79d}$$

Since $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is κ-linearly regular on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$,

$$\max_{i\in I} d_{C_i}(x_0) \ge \frac{1}{\kappa} d_C(x_0). \tag{80}$$

Lemma 4.4(ii) then yields

$$\forall p \in \Omega: \quad \|x_m - p\|^2 \le (\gamma_1\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_m)\|x_0 - p\|^2 - \frac{\beta\nu^2}{m} \max_{i\in I} d^2_{C_i}(x_0) \tag{81a}$$

$$\le (\gamma_1\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_m)\|x_0 - p\|^2 - \frac{\beta\nu^2}{m\kappa^2} d^2_C(x_0). \tag{81b}$$

Let $p \in P_C x_0 \subseteq \Omega$ (by Lemma 3.4). So

$$\|x_m - p\|^2 \le (\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_m) d^2_C(x_0) - \frac{\beta\nu^2}{m\kappa^2} d^2_C(x_0) \le \left[\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_m - \frac{\beta\nu^2}{m\kappa^2}\right]_+ d^2_C(x_0), \tag{82}$$

which leads to (78). Now suppose $\rho = \left[\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_m - \frac{\beta\nu^2}{m\kappa^2}\right]_+^{1/2} < 1$, (78) means

$$\forall x_0 \in I\!B_{\delta_0}(w): \quad d_C(x_m) \leq \rho d_C(x_0). \tag{83}$$

So (79) and (83) imply for every tuple $(z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_m) := (x_{mn}, x_{mn+1}, \ldots, x_{mn+m})$ with $\|z_0 - w\| \leq \delta_0$, we have

$$d_C(z_m) \leq \rho d_C(z_0) \quad \text{and} \tag{84a}$$

$$\forall i \in I,\ \forall p \in C \cap I\!B_{2\delta_0}(w): \quad \|z_i - p\| \leq \Gamma\|z_0 - p\|, \tag{84b}$$

which fulfills the assumption (61) with $k = m$. The result then follows from Lemma 4.3. ■

Theorem 4.6 (cyclic sequence with one quasi Fejér monotone operator). *Let $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ and $\gamma_i \in [1, +\infty[$ for all $i \in I$. Let $w \in C := \bigcap_{i\in I} C_i$ and $\Omega := C \cap I\!B_\delta(w)$. Let $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a cyclic sequence generated by $(T_i)_{i\in I}$. Suppose that*

(i) *$\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is κ-linearly regular on $I\!B_{\delta/2}(w)$ for some $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$.*

(ii) *There are $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ and $\nu \in]0, 1]$ such that for all $i \in I \smallsetminus \{1\}$, T_i is $(\Omega, \gamma_i, \beta)$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone and (C_i, ν)-quasi coercive on $I\!B_{\delta/2}(w)$; while T_1 is (Ω, γ_1)-quasi Fejér monotone and $T_1 x \subseteq C_1$ for all $x \in I\!B_{\delta/2}(w)$.*

Then whenever $\|x_0 - w\| \leq (\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{m-1})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\delta}{2}$, we have

$$d_C(x_m) \leq \left[\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_m - \frac{\gamma_1\beta\nu^2}{(m-1)\kappa^2}\right]_+^{1/2} d_C(x_0). \tag{85}$$

Consequently, if $\rho := \left[\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_m - \frac{\gamma_1\beta\nu^2}{(m-1)\kappa^2}\right]_+^{1/2} < 1$ and x_0 is sufficiently close to w, then $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges R-linearly to some point $\overline{x} \in C$ with rate at most $\rho^{1/m}$.

Proof. Set

$$\delta_0 := (\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{m-1})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\delta}{2} \leq \delta_1 := (\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_{m-1})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\delta}{2} \leq \frac{\delta}{2}. \tag{86}$$

Assume that $x_1 \in C_1$ and $\|x_1 - w\| \leq \delta_1$. We first claim that

$$d_C(x_m) \leq \left[\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_m - \frac{\beta\nu^2}{(m-1)\kappa^2}\right]_+^{1/2} d_C(x_1). \tag{87}$$

Indeed, on the one hand, applying Lemma 4.4(ii) to the system $(C_i)_{i\in I\smallsetminus\{1\}}$ and m consecutive points $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ with $\|x_1 - w\| \leq \delta_1$, we deduce that

$$\forall p \in \Omega: \quad \|x_m - p\|^2 \leq (\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_m)\|x_1 - p\|^2 - \frac{\beta\nu^2}{m-1} \max_{i\in I\smallsetminus\{1\}} d_{C_i}^2(x_1). \tag{88}$$

On the other hand, noting $d_{C_1}(x_1) = 0$ and the linear regularity of $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$, we have

$$\max_{i\in I\smallsetminus\{1\}} d_{C_i}(x_1) = \max_{i\in I} d_{C_i}(x_1) \geq \frac{1}{\kappa} d_C(x_1). \tag{89}$$

From (88) and (89), setting $p \in P_C x_1 \subseteq C \cap \mathbb{B}_\delta(w) = \Omega$ (see Lemma 3.4(i)), we obtain

$$d_C^2(x_m) \leq \|x_m - p\|^2 \leq (\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_m)\|x_1 - p\|^2 - \frac{\beta\nu^2}{(m-1)} \max_{i\in I} d_{C_i}^2(x_1) \tag{90a}$$

$$\leq (\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_m) d_C^2(x_1) - \frac{\beta\nu^2}{(m-1)\kappa^2} d_C^2(x_1) \tag{90b}$$

$$\leq \left[\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_m - \frac{\beta\nu^2}{(m-1)\kappa^2}\right]_+ d_C^2(x_1). \tag{90c}$$

This implies the claim (87).

Now let $x_0 \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta_0}(w) \subseteq \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$. Since T_i is quasi Fejér monotone with respect to Ω and $\mathbb{B}_{2\delta_0}(w) \subseteq \Omega$, we use (68b) in Lemma 4.4(i) to obtain

$$\forall i \in I,\ \forall p \in C \cap \mathbb{B}_{2\delta_0}(w) : \tag{91a}$$

$$\|x_i - p\| \leq (\gamma_i)^{1/2}\|x_{i-1} - p\| \leq (\gamma_i\gamma_{i-1})^{1/2}\|x_{i-2} - p\| \tag{91b}$$

$$\leq \cdots \tag{91c}$$

$$\leq (\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_{m-1})^{1/2}\|x_0 - p\| =: \Gamma\|x_0 - p\|. \tag{91d}$$

In particular, we have $\|x_1 - w\| \leq (\gamma_1)^{1/2}\|x_0 - w\| \leq (\gamma_1)^{1/2}\delta_0 = \delta_1$. We also have $x_1 \in C_1$ by the assumption on T_1. Substituting this into (87) will yield (85).

Now (91) and (85) imply that for every tuple $(z_0, z_1, \ldots, z_m) := (x_{mn}, x_{mn+1}, \ldots, x_{mn+m})$ with $\|z_0 - w\| \leq \delta_0$, we have

$$d_C(z_m) \leq \rho d_C(z_0) \quad \text{and} \tag{92a}$$

$$\forall i \in I,\ \forall p \in C \cap \mathbb{B}_{2\delta_0}(w) : \quad \|z_i - p\| \leq \Gamma\|z_0 - p\|, \tag{92b}$$

which fulfills the assumption (61) with $k = m$. Thus, R-linear convergence of $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ then follows from Lemma 4.3. ■

Remark 4.7 (order rearrangement). It is obvious that a similar conclusion to Theorem 4.6 still holds if we modify assumption (ii) as

(ii) There are $j \in I$, $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ and $\nu \in]0, 1]$ such that for all $i \in I\smallsetminus\{j\}$, T_i is $(\Omega, \gamma_i, \beta)$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone and (C_i, ν)-quasi coercive on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$; while T_j is (Ω, γ_j)-quasi Fejér monotone and $T_j x \subseteq C_j$ for all $x \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$.

In the next result, we show that if in addition the image of each operator T_i lies in the corresponding set C_i, then linear reduction is obtained after $m - 1$ steps. Thus, the rate of convergence is *improved*. This special condition is satisfied for certain operators such as projectors and semi-intrepid projectors (see Section 5.2).

Theorem 4.8 (refined R-linear convergence). *Let $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ and $\gamma_i \in [1, +\infty[$ for all $i \in I$. Set $\Gamma := \left(\max_{i\in I} \frac{\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_m}{\gamma_i}\right)^{1/2}$ and $\delta_0 := \frac{\delta}{2\Gamma}$. Let $w \in C := \bigcap_{i\in I} C_i$ and $\Omega := C \cap \mathbb{B}_\delta(w)$. Let $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a cyclic sequence generated by $(T_i)_{i\in I}$. Suppose that*

(i) *$\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is κ-linearly regular on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$ for some $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$.*

(ii) *There is $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that for all $i \in I$, T_i is $(\Omega, \gamma_i, \beta)$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$.*

(iii) $\forall i \in I,\ \forall x \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)\colon\quad T_i x \subseteq C_i$.

Then

$$\forall i \in I,\ \forall x_i \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta_0}(w):\quad d_C(x_{m-1+i}) \leq \left[\Gamma^2 - \frac{\beta}{(m-1)\kappa^2}\right]_+^{1/2} d_C(x_i). \tag{93}$$

Consequently, if $\rho := \left[\Gamma^2 - \frac{\beta}{(m-1)\kappa^2}\right]_+^{1/2} < 1$ and x_0 is sufficiently close to w, then $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges R-linearly to some point $\overline{x} \in C$ with rate at most $\rho^{\frac{1}{m-1}}$.

Proof. First, notice that $x_i \in C_i$ for all $i \geq 1$. Take m consecutive points $(x_i, \ldots, x_{i+m-1})$ of $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $\|x_i - w\| \leq \delta_0$ and $x_i \in C_i$. For simplicity, we consider only the case $i = 1$, since other cases are identical subject to relabeling. Notice that

$$\|x_1 - w\| \leq \delta_0 = \frac{\delta}{2\Gamma} \leq (\gamma_2 \ldots \gamma_{m-1})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\delta}{2}, \tag{94}$$

and that $C \cap \mathbb{B}_{2\delta_0} \subset \Omega$. On the one hand, since T_i is quasi Fejér monotone with respect to Ω we use Lemma 4.4(i) for the system $(T_i, C_i)_{i\in I\smallsetminus\{1\}}$ to derive

$$\forall i \in I,\ \forall p \in C \cap \mathbb{B}_{2\delta_0}(w): \tag{95a}$$

$$\|x_i - p\| \leq (\gamma_i)^{1/2} \|x_{i-1} - p\| \leq (\gamma_i \gamma_{i-1})^{1/2} \|x_{i-2} - p\| \tag{95b}$$

$$\leq \cdots \tag{95c}$$

$$\leq (\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_{m-1})^{1/2} \|x_1 - p\| \leq \Gamma \|x_1 - p\|. \tag{95d}$$

On the other hand, (iii) implies

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w),\ \forall x_+ \in T_i x:\quad \|x_+ - x\| \geq d_{C_i}(x). \tag{96}$$

That means T_i is $(C_i, 1)$-quasi coercive on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$. So all assumptions in Theorem 4.6 are fulfilled. Thus, claim (87) holds due to $x_1 \in C_1$ and (94). So we have

$$d_C(x_m) \leq \left[\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_m - \frac{\beta}{(m-1)\kappa^2}\right]_+^{1/2} d_C(x_1) \leq \left[\Gamma - \frac{\beta}{(m-1)\kappa^2}\right]_+^{1/2} d_C(x_1). \tag{97}$$

Now (95) and (97) imply that for every tuple $(z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_m) := (x_{(m-1)n+1}, x_{(m-1)n+2}, \ldots, x_{(m-1)(n+1)})$ with $\|z_1 - w\| \leq \delta_0$, we have

$$d_C(z_m) \leq \rho d_C(z_1) \quad \text{and} \tag{98a}$$

$$\forall i \in I,\ \forall p \in C \cap I\!B_{2\delta_0}(w): \quad \|z_i - p\| \leq \Gamma \|z_1 - p\|, \tag{98b}$$

which fulfills the assumption (61) with $k = m - 1$. Thus, R-linear convergence of $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ then follows from Lemma 4.3. ■

5 Application to projection algorithms

5.1 Cyclic relaxed projections

In this section, by specializing operators T_i to relaxed projectors $P_{C_i}^{\lambda_i}$, we obtain linear convergence results for the cyclic relaxed projections, one of which is possibly a *reflection over an injectable set*. First, we give the definition for injectability.

Definition 5.1 (injectable set). Let C be a nonempty closed subset of X, and let $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_+$. We say that C is τ-*injectable* on U if

$$\forall x \in U,\ \forall p \in P_C x: \quad \left[p, p + \tau \tfrac{p-x}{\|p-x\|}\right] \subseteq C, \tag{99}$$

with the convention that $\frac{p-x}{\|p-x\|} = 0$ if $p = x$. We say that C is *strictly injectable* around $w \in X$ if there exist $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that C is τ-injectable on $I\!B_\delta(w)$. When C is τ-injectable on $U = X$, we simply say that C is τ-injectable. Clearly if $\tau > \tau' \geq 0$ then τ-injectability implies τ'-injectability.

Lemma 5.2. *Let C be a nonempty closed subset of X, and let $w \in C$. Suppose that C is strictly injectable around w. Then there exists $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that*

$$\forall \lambda \in [1, 2],\ \forall x \in I\!B_\delta(w): \quad P_C^\lambda x \subseteq C. \tag{100}$$

Proof. Since C is strictly injectable around w, we can find $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that C is δ-injectable on $I\!B_\delta(w)$, i.e.,

$$\forall x \in I\!B_\delta(w),\ \forall p \in P_C x \smallsetminus \{x\}: \quad \left[p, p + \delta \tfrac{p-x}{\|p-x\|}\right] \subseteq C. \tag{101}$$

Let $\lambda \in [1, 2]$, $x \in I\!B_\delta(w)$, $x_+ \in P_C^\lambda x$, and write $x_+ = (1-\lambda)x + \lambda p = p + (\lambda - 1)(p - x)$ for some $p \in P_C x$. Now assume that $p \neq x$, then $0 < \|p - x\| = d_C(x) \leq \|x - w\| \leq \delta$. Since $\lambda \in [1, 2]$ we have $0 \leq \lambda - 1 \leq 1 \leq \frac{\delta}{\|p-x\|}$. Combining with (101) yields

$$x_+ = p + (\lambda - 1)(p - x) \in \left[p, p + \delta \frac{p-x}{\|p-x\|}\right] \subseteq C. \tag{102}$$

■

Recall from [13, Section 3.2] that a closed convex cone K of X is obtuse if $-K^{\ominus} \subseteq K$, where $K^{\ominus}$ is the negative polar of K defined by

$$K^{\ominus} := \big\{ y \in X \;\big|\; \forall x \in K : \; \langle x, y \rangle \leq 0 \big\}. \tag{103}$$

The following result is a variant of [7, Lemma 2.1(v)].

Lemma 5.3. *Let C be a translation of an obtuse cone in X. Then*

$$\forall \lambda \in [1, +\infty[\,, \; \forall x \in X : \quad P_C^{\lambda} x \in C. \tag{104}$$

Consequently, C is ∞-injectable.

Proof. By assumption, there exist a vector c and an obtuse cone K in X such that $C = c + K$. First, we clearly have $C + K = c + K + K = c + K = C$ since K is a convex cone.

Now let $x \in X$, and set $p = P_C x$, which is unique since C is convex. It is straightforward to check that

$$p - x \in -N_C^{\mathrm{prox}}(p) \subseteq -K^{\ominus} \subseteq K. \tag{105}$$

So, for every $\lambda \in [1, +\infty[$, we have

$$P_C^{\lambda} x = (1 - \lambda)x + \lambda p = p + (\lambda - 1)(p - x) \subseteq C + K = C. \tag{106}$$

Hence, we conclude that C is ∞-injectable. ■

We extend the concept of enlargement for convex sets in [5] to general sets.

Definition 5.4 (enlargement). Given a nonempty closed subset D of X and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_+$, the *τ-enlargement* of D is defined by

$$D_{[\tau]} := \big\{ x \in X \;\big|\; d_D(x) \leq \tau \big\} = D + I\!B_{\tau}(0). \tag{107}$$

Proposition 5.5. *Let $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Then every τ-enlargement is 2τ-injectable.*

Proof. Let C be a τ-enlargement, say, $C = D + I\!B_{\tau}(0)$. Let $x \in X \smallsetminus C$, let $p \in P_C x$. There exists $q \in D$ such that $\|p - q\| \leq \tau$. Then x, p, q must lie on the same line. Suppose otherwise, then

$$\|x - q\| < \|x - p\| + \|p - q\| \leq d_C(x) + \tau. \tag{108}$$

Take a point $z = q + \tau \frac{x-q}{\|x-q\|} \in [x, q]$. Then $z \in I\!B_{\tau}(q) \subseteq C$ and $\|x - z\| = \|x - q\| - \tau < d_C(x)$, which is a contradiction. From here, we easily derive

$$\Big[p, p + 2\tau \tfrac{p-x}{\|p-x\|} \Big] \subseteq q + I\!B_{\tau}(0) \subseteq C, \tag{109}$$

and C is thus 2τ-injectable. ■

Remark 5.6. The reverse of Proposition 5.5 is not true. For example, consider the obtuse cone $C := \mathbb{R}^2_+$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$. For every $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, C is τ-injectable but it is not τ-enlargements of any subset of $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Theorem 5.7 (linear convergence with at most one reflection). *Let $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, $\varepsilon \in [0,1[$, and $w \in C := \bigcap_{i\in I} C_i$. Suppose that*

(i) *$\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is κ-linearly regular around w for some $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_+$.*

(ii) *$\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is (ε,δ)-regular at w.*

(iii) *$\lambda_i \in]0,2]$ for all $i \in I$, and there is at most one λ_j equal to 2 and the corresponding set C_j is strictly injectable around w*

(iv) *Define $J := \big\{j \in I \;\big|\; \lambda_j = 2\big\}$, $\Lambda := \max\limits_{i\in I\smallsetminus J} \lambda_i$, $\nu := \min\limits_{i\in I\smallsetminus J}\{1,\lambda_i\}$, and suppose*

$$\rho := \left[\prod_{i\in I}\Big(1+\tfrac{\lambda_i\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\Big) - \frac{(2-\Lambda)\nu^2}{(m-|J|)\Lambda\kappa^2}\prod_{j\in J}\Big(1+\tfrac{\lambda_j\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\Big)\right]_+^{\frac{1}{2m}} < 1. \tag{110}$$

Then whenever the starting point is sufficiently close to w, the cyclic sequence generated by the relaxed projections $(P_{C_i}^{\lambda_i})_{i\in I}$ converges R-linearly to a point $\overline{x} \in C$ with rate at most ρ.

Proof. Set $\Omega := C \cap \mathbb{B}_\delta(w)$ and for $i \in I$, set $\gamma_i := 1 + \frac{\lambda_i\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}$. Note also that

$$\min_{i\in I\smallsetminus J} \frac{2-\lambda_i}{\lambda_i} = \frac{2-\Lambda}{\Lambda}. \tag{111}$$

Lemma 3.5 implies for every $i \in I$, $P_{C_i}^{\lambda_i}$ is $(C_i\cap\mathbb{B}_\delta(w), \gamma_i, \frac{2-\lambda_i}{\lambda_i})$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$; thus, $P_{C_i}^{\lambda_i}$ is $(\Omega, \gamma_i, \frac{2-\Lambda}{\Lambda})$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$. And Lemma 3.6 implies $P_{C_i}^{\lambda_i}$ is (C_i, λ_i)-quasi coercive on X; thus, $P_{C_i}^{\lambda_i}$ is (C_i, ν)-quasi coercive on X.

We consider two cases.

Case 1: J is empty. Then $\Lambda = \max_{i\in I}\lambda_i > 0$, so $\frac{2-\Lambda}{\Lambda} > 0$. So, we can apply Theorem 4.6 to derive that whenever x_0 is sufficiently close to w, the sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges R-linearly with rate

$$\rho = \left[\prod_{i\in I}\Big(1+\tfrac{\lambda_i\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\Big) - \frac{(2-\Lambda)\nu^2}{m\Lambda\kappa^2}\right]_+^{\frac{1}{2m}} < 1. \tag{112}$$

Case 2: J is singleton. Then without loss of generality we can assume $J = \{1\}$, so $\lambda_1 = 2$ and $\gamma_1 = 1 + \frac{\lambda_1\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} = \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}$. Using Lemma 5.2 and shrinking δ if necessary, we also have

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w): \quad P_{C_1}^{\lambda_1} x \subseteq C_1. \tag{113}$$

It follows from Lemma 3.5 that $R_{C_1} = P_{C_1}^{\lambda_1}$ is (C_1, γ_1)-quasi Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$. Thus, we apply Theorem 4.6 to derive that whenever x_0 is sufficiently close to w, the sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges R-linearly with rate

$$\rho := \left[\prod_{i\in I}\left(1+\tfrac{\lambda_i\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\right) - \frac{\gamma_1(2-\Lambda)\nu^2}{(m-1)\Lambda\kappa^2}\right]_+^{\frac{1}{2m}} < 1, \tag{114}$$

Combining the two formulas for ρ, we obtain (110) and complete the proof. ■

Theorem 5.8 (refined linear convergence with all injectable sets). *Let $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, $\varepsilon \in [0,1[$, and $w \in C := \bigcap_{i\in I} C_i$. Suppose that*

(i) *$\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is κ-linearly regular around w for some $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_+$.*

(ii) *$\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is (ε,δ)-regular at w.*

(iii) *For all $i \in I$, $\lambda_i \in [1,2[$ and C_i is strictly injectable around w.*

(iv) *Define $\Lambda := \max\limits_{i\in I}\lambda_i < 2$ and suppose*

$$\rho := \left[\max_{j\in I}\prod_{i\in I\smallsetminus\{j\}}\left(1+\frac{\lambda_i\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\right) - \frac{(2-\Lambda)}{(m-1)\Lambda\kappa^2}\right]_+^{\frac{1}{2(m-1)}} < 1. \tag{115}$$

Then whenever the starting point is sufficiently close to w, the cyclic sequence generated by the relaxed projections $(P_{C_i}^{\lambda_i})_{i\in I}$ converges R-linearly to a point $\overline{x} \in C$ with rate at most ρ.

Proof. By Lemma 5.2, we shrink δ if necessary so that

$$\forall i \in I,\ \forall x \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w): \quad P_{C_i}^{\lambda_i}x \subseteq C_i. \tag{116}$$

Lemma 3.5 implies for every $i \in I$, $P_{C_i}^{\lambda_i}$ is $(C_i\cap\mathbb{B}_\delta(w), \gamma_i, \frac{2-\lambda_i}{\lambda_i})$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$; thus, $P_{C_i}^{\lambda_i}$ is $(C\cap\mathbb{B}_\delta(w), \gamma_i, \frac{2-\Lambda}{\Lambda})$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$. Now all assumptions in Theorem 4.8 are satisfied. The conclusion then follows from Theorem 4.8. ■

Remark 5.9 (refined linear rate). One can observe that, given the same constants $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, $\lambda_i \in [1,2[$, and $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, the (upper bound) rate ρ in (115) is *smaller* than the one in (110). Thus, if all sets are injectable, we actually obtain better upper bound.

Theorem 5.10 (refined linear convergence for classic cyclic projections). *Let $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, $\varepsilon \in [0,1[$, and $w \in C := \bigcap_{i\in I} C_i$. Suppose that*

(i) *$\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is κ-linearly regular around w for some $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_+$.*

(ii) *$\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is (ε,δ)-regular at w.*

(iii) *Suppose*

$$\rho := \left[\frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon)^{m-1}} - \frac{1}{(m-1)\kappa^2}\right]_+^{\frac{1}{2(m-1)}} < 1. \tag{117}$$

Then whenever the starting point is sufficiently close to w, the cyclic sequence generated by the classic projections $(P_{C_i})_{i\in I}$ converges R-linearly to a point $\overline{x} \in C$ with rate at most ρ.

Proof. First, clearly for all $i \in I$ and for all $x \in X$, $P_{C_i}x \subset C_i$. Lemma 3.5 implies for every $i \in I$, P_{C_i} is $(C_i \cap \mathbb{B}_\delta(w), \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}, 1)$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$; thus, P_{C_i} is $(C \cap \mathbb{B}_\delta(w), \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}, 1)$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$. Now all assumptions in Theorem 4.8 are satisfied. The conclusion then follows from Theorem 4.8. ■

Theorem 5.11. *Let $w \in C := \bigcap_{i\in I} C_i$, and let $\lambda_i \in]0, 2]$ for all $i \in I$, where there is at most one λ_i equal to 2 with the corresponding C_i being strictly injectable around w. Suppose that the system $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is linearly regular around w and superregular at w. Then when started at a point sufficiently close to w, the cyclic relaxed projections sequence generated by $(P_{C_i}^{\lambda_i})_{i\in I}$ converges R-*linearly *to a point $\overline{x} \in C$.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon \in]0, 1[$. Since $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is superregular at w, there exists $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is (ε, δ)-regular at w. Borrowing notation from Theorem 5.7 and noting that $\frac{(2-\Lambda)\lambda^2}{(m-|J|)\Lambda\kappa^2} > 0$ and $1 + \frac{\lambda_i\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} \to 1^+$ as $\varepsilon \to 0^+$, we choose ε sufficiently small such that $\rho < 1$. The conclusion then follows from Theorem 5.7. ■

Corollary 5.12 (global linear convergence in convex settings). *Let $\lambda_i \in]0, 2]$ for all $i \in I$, and there is at most one λ_i equal to 2 with the corresponding C_i being a translation of an obtuse cone in X. Suppose that for every $i \in I$, C_i is convex, and that $\bigcap_{i\in I_p} C_i \cap \bigcap_{i\in I\smallsetminus I_p} \operatorname{ri} C_i \neq \varnothing$, where $I_p := \big\{i \in I \;\big|\; C_i \text{ is polyhedral}\big\}$. Then regardless of the starting point, the cyclic relaxed projections sequence generated by $(P_{C_i}^{\lambda_i})_{i\in I}$ converges R-*linearly *to a point $\overline{x} \in C := \bigcap_{i\in I} C_i$. In particular, for every $w \in C$, for every $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, there exists $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is κ-linearly regular on $\mathbb{B}_\delta(w)$, and whenever $\|x_0 - w\| \leq \frac{\delta(1-\rho)}{3-\rho}$, the linear rate is at most*

$$\rho := \left[1 - \frac{(2-\Lambda)\lambda^2}{(m-|J|)\Lambda\kappa^2}\right]_+^{\frac{1}{2m}}, \tag{118}$$

where $J := \big\{i \in I \;\big|\; \lambda_i = 2\big\}$, $\Lambda := \max\limits_{i\in I\smallsetminus J} \lambda_i$ and $\lambda := \min\limits_{i\in I\smallsetminus J}\{1, \lambda_i\}$.

Proof. Employing [1, Corollary 5], we have $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is linearly regular on every bounded set. Notice that every convex set is $(0, +\infty)$-regular at every point, so the result follows immediately from Theorem 5.7 and Lemma 5.3. ■

Remark 5.13. When $\lambda_1 = 2, \lambda_2 = \cdots = \lambda_m = 1$ in Corollary 5.12, the cyclic relaxed projections is actually the method of reflection-projection, which was studied in [7] with the reflection onto an obtuse cone. Again, Corollary 5.12 is the *first* result to conclude the global linear convergence for the reflection-projection algorithm.

We finish this section by the following examples showing that convergence may fail even in convex settings if there are *more* than one λ_i equal to 2 or if strict injectability of C_j corresponding to $\lambda_j = 2$ is violated.

Example 5.14 (failure of convergence when more than one λ_i equal to 2). In $X = \mathbb{R}^2$, consider two convex sets $C_1 = \mathbb{R}^2_+$ and $C_2 = (-\mathbb{R}_+)^2$. Then C_1 and C_2 are obtuse cones and also polyhedral sets in X with $C_1 \cap C_2 = \{(0,0)\} \neq \varnothing$. Clearly, $\{C_1, C_2\}$ is linear regular as in Definition 2.2.

It is easy to see that when started at a point $x_0 = (\zeta, \xi) \in X \smallsetminus \{(0,0)\}$, the sequence generated by (R_{C_1}, R_{C_2}) does not converge since it cycles between two points $(|\zeta|, |\xi|)$ and $(-|\zeta|, -|\xi|)$.

Example 5.15 (failure of convergence without strict injectability). Suppose that $X = \mathbb{R}^2$, that $C_1 = \mathbb{R} \times \{0\}$, and that $C_2 = \{0\} \times \mathbb{R}$. Then C_1 and C_2 are polyhedral, and $C_1 \cap C_2 = \{(0,0)\} \neq \varnothing$, but for $x_0 = (0, \xi)$ with $\xi \in \mathbb{R} \smallsetminus \{0\}$, the sequence generated by (R_{C_1}, P_{C_2}) cycles indefinitely between $x_0 = (0, \xi)$, $x_1 = (0, -\xi)$, $x_2 = (0, -\xi)$ and $x_3 = (0, \xi)$.

5.2 Cyclic semi-intrepid projections

Cyclic intrepid projections [5, 6] have found their applications in solving the feasibility problem (1), notably the road design problems [6]. The idea is to modify the cyclic projection in the following way: at every projection P_{C_i}, one tries to be "more aggressive" by extrapolating into the set C_i whenever possible. However, there is little incentive to "leave" the set C_i, therefore, the ratio is limited such that the extrapolated point remain within the set. Motivated by this, we give the definition of semi-intrepid projection as follows.

Definition 5.16 (semi-intrepid projector into injectable sets). Let $\alpha \in [0,1]$, let $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and let $x \in X$. The *α-intrepid projection* of x into a τ-injectable set C is defined by $P_C^{(\alpha,\tau)} x = x$ if $x \in C$, and

$$P_C^{(\alpha,\tau)} x = \left\{ p + (p - x) \min\{\alpha, \tfrac{\tau}{\|p-x\|}\} \;\middle|\; p \in P_C x \right\} \quad \text{if } x \notin C. \tag{119}$$

Remark 5.17. When $\alpha = 0$, $P_C^{(0,\tau)}$ is just the projection onto C. When $\alpha = 1$, $P_C^{(1,\tau)}$ is the original intrepid projection in [5].

Lemma 5.18. *Let $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and let C is a τ-injectable set in X. Then*

$$\forall \alpha \in [0,1],\ \forall x \in X: \quad P_C^{(\alpha,\tau)} x \subseteq C. \tag{120}$$

Proof. The proof is straightforward from the definition. ■

Lemma 5.19 (quasi firm Fejér monotonicity). *Let $\tau, \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, and $\alpha \in [0,1]$. Let C be a τ-injectable set and assume that C is (ε, δ)-regular around $w \in C$. Then the semi-intrepid projector $P_C^{(\alpha,\tau)}$ is $(C \cap \mathbb{B}_\delta(w), \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}, \frac{1+\alpha\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon})$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$.*

Proof. Set $\Omega := C \cap \mathbb{B}_\delta(w)$. Take $x \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$ and $x_+ \in P_C^{(\alpha,\tau)}x$. There exists $p \in P_C x$ such that

$$x_+ = p + \alpha'(p-x) = x + (1+\alpha')(p-x) \quad \text{where} \quad \alpha' := \min\{\alpha, \tfrac{\tau}{\|x-p\|}\}. \tag{121}$$

So, x_+ is an image of the relaxed projection $P_C^{1+\alpha'}x$. So, Lemma 3.5 implies

$$\forall \overline{x} \in \Omega: \quad \|x_+ - \overline{x}\|^2 + \tfrac{2-(1+\alpha')}{1+\alpha'}\|x_+ - x\|^2 \leq \Big(1 + \tfrac{(1+\alpha')\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\Big)\|x-\overline{x}\|^2 \tag{122}$$

As $\alpha' \leq \alpha$, one can check that $\frac{2-(1+\alpha')}{1+\alpha'} \geq \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}$ and $1 + \frac{(1+\alpha')\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} \leq \frac{1+\alpha\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}$. So,

$$\forall \overline{x} \in C \cap \mathbb{B}_\delta(w): \quad \|x_+ - \overline{x}\|^2 + \tfrac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha}\|x_+ - x\|^2 \leq \Big(\tfrac{1+\alpha\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\Big)\|x-\overline{x}\|^2, \tag{123}$$

Hence, $P_C^{(\alpha,\tau)}$ is $(\Omega, \frac{1+\alpha\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}, \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\alpha})$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$. ■

We now prove the R-linear convergence for the cyclic semi-intrepid projections. We note that indeed one of the operator is allowed to be the original intrepid projection.

Theorem 5.20 (cyclic semi-intrepid projections). *Let $w \in C := \bigcap_{i\in I} C_i$, let $\varepsilon \in]0,1[$, let $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$, and let $\tau_i \in \mathbb{R}_+$ for all $i \in I$. Suppose that the system $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is κ-linearly regular around w, (ε,δ)-regular at w, and τ_i-injectable around w. Let $\alpha_i \in [0,1]$ for all $i \in I$, where there is at most one α_i equal to 1. Then if the starting point is sufficiently close to w, the cyclic sequence generated by semi-intrepid projections $\big(P_{C_i}^{(\alpha_i,\tau_i)}\big)_{i\in I}$ converges R-linearly to a point in C.*

Proof. Clearly, $P_{C_i}^{(\alpha_i,\tau_i)}$ is $(C_i,1)$-quasi coercive on X. By Lemma 5.19, We also have $P_{C_i}^{(\alpha_i,\tau_i)}$ is $(\Omega, \frac{1+\alpha_i\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}, \frac{1-\alpha_i}{1+\alpha_i})$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$. Define also

$$\beta := \min\big\{\tfrac{1-\alpha_i}{1+\alpha_i} \;\big|\; \alpha_i < 1\big\}. \tag{124}$$

Since at most one α_i equals to 1, there is at most one $P_{C_i}^{(\alpha_i,\tau_i)}$ that is $(\Omega, \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon})$-quasi Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$; while all other $P_{C_i}^{(\alpha_i,\tau_i)}$ is $(\Omega, \frac{1+\alpha_i\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}, \beta)$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$. The conclusion now follows from Theorem 4.6 (see Remark 4.7). ■

5.3 Algorithms involving generalized Douglas–Rachford operators

For all $i \in I$, let $\lambda_i \in]0,2]$ and $\alpha_i \in]0,1]$. Setting $C_{m+1} := C_1$ and $\lambda_{m+1} := \lambda_1$, we consider the generalized Douglas–Rachford operators

$$\forall i \in I: \quad T_i := (1-\alpha_i)\,\mathrm{Id} + \alpha_i P_{C_{i+1}}^{\lambda_{i+1}} P_{C_i}^{\lambda_i}. \tag{125}$$

In this section, we prove that the generalized DR also possesses R-linear convergence properties. In fact, the DR algorithm also converges R-linearly in other settings where cyclic projections may not, more details can be found in [3, 4].

Theorem 5.21 (linear convergence of cyclic generalized DR algorithm). *Let $w \in C := \bigcap_{i\in I} C_i$. Suppose that the system $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is strongly regular at w and superregular at w. Then when started at a point sufficiently close to w, every cyclic sequence generated by generalized Douglas–Rachford operators $(T_i)_{i\in I}$ defined by* (125) *converges* R-linearly *to a point $\overline{x} \in C$.*

Proof. Let $i \in I$. We have $w \in C_i \cap C_{i+1}$, and by Remark 2.4, $\{C_i, C_{i+1}\}$ is strongly regular at w. By the superregularity of C_i at w and Lemma 3.8, there exists $\nu_i \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that T_i is $(C_i \cap C_{i+1}, \nu_i)$-quasi coercive around w.

Next let $\varepsilon \in]0, 1/3]$. Since $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is superregular at w, there exists $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that C_i is $(\varepsilon, (\sqrt{2})^i\delta)$-regular at w for every $i \in I$. Then C_i and C_{i+1} are (ε, δ)- and $(\varepsilon, \sqrt{2}\delta)$-regular at w, respectively. Using Lemma 3.7, T_i is $(C_i \cap C_{i+1}, \gamma_i, \frac{1-\alpha_i}{\alpha_i})$-quasi firmly Fejér monotone on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$, where

$$\gamma_i := 1 - \alpha_i + \alpha_i \left(1 + \frac{\lambda_i\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\right)\left(1 + \frac{\lambda_{i+1}\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\right) \to 1^+ \quad \text{as} \quad \varepsilon \to 0^+. \tag{126}$$

Now by the strong regularity of $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ at w and Fact 2.5, there exists $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ such that $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is κ-linearly regular around w. Shrinking δ if necessary, we have

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w): \quad d_C(x) \le \kappa \max_{i\in I} d_{C_i}(x). \tag{127}$$

Since $C_i \cap C_{i+1} \subseteq C_i$,

$$\forall i \in I,\ \forall x \in X: \quad d_{C_i}(x) \le d_{C_i\cap C_{i+1}}(x). \tag{128}$$

Noting that

$$\bigcap_{i\in I}(C_i \cap C_{i+1}) = \bigcap_{i\in I} C_i = C, \tag{129}$$

we conclude that the system $\{C_i \cap C_{i+1}\}_{i\in I}$ is also κ-linearly regular on $\mathbb{B}_{\delta/2}(w)$.

On the other hand, Lemma 3.8 guarantees that each T_i is $(C_i \cap C_{i+1})$-quasi coercive around$w$. Thus, applying Theorem 4.5 for $(T_i)_{i\in I}$ and the corresponding sets $(C_i \cap C_{i+1})_{i\in I}$, we obtain the R-linear convergence. ■

In the case $m = 2$, we obtain a generalization of [20, Theorem 4.3].

Corollary 5.22. *Let A and B be closed subsets of X such that $A \cap B \neq \varnothing$, let $w \in A \cap B$, let $\lambda, \mu \in]0, 2]$, let $\alpha \in]0, 1]$, and set*

$$T := (1 - \alpha)\,\mathrm{Id} + \alpha P_B^\mu P_A^\lambda. \tag{130}$$

Suppose that the system $\{A, B\}$ is strongly regular at w and superregular at w. Then when started at a point sufficiently close to w, the generalized Douglas–Rachford sequence generated by T converges R-linearly *to a point $\overline{x} \in C$.*

Proof. Apply Theorem 5.21 for the system $\{A, B\}$. ■

We now set $I' := I \smallsetminus \{1\}$ and assume that

$$(\forall i \in I') \quad T_i := (1-\alpha_i)\,\mathrm{Id} + \alpha_i P_{C_i}^{\lambda_i} P_{C_1}^{\lambda_1}. \tag{131}$$

Theorem 5.23 (linear convergence of cyclically anchored DRA). *Let $w \in C := \bigcap_{i\in I} C_i$. Suppose that the system $\{C_i\}_{i\in I}$ is strongly regular at w and superregular at w. Then when started at a point sufficiently close to w, every cyclic sequence generated by the anchored Douglas–Rachford operators $(T_i)_{i\in I}$ (see* (131)*) converges* R-linearly *to a point $\overline{x} \in C$.*

Proof. This is similar to the proof of Theorem 5.21. ■

5.4 Affine reduction for generalized Douglas–Rachford sequences

In this section, we extend the affine reduction in [20, Section 3] to generalized Douglas–Rachford sequences. Let A and B be two closed sets. Let $\lambda_n, \mu_n \in]1,2]$, $\alpha_n \in]0,1[$, a generalized DR sequence is given by

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}: \quad x_{n+1} \in (1-\alpha_n)x_n + \alpha_n P_B^{\mu_n} P_A^{\lambda_n} x_n. \tag{132}$$

We start with the following extension of [20, Lemma 3.1] whose proof is omitted.

Lemma 5.24. *Let L is an affine subspace. Suppose $A \subseteq L$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The following hold*

(i) *For all $y \in P_A^\lambda x$, $y - P_L y = (1-\lambda)(x - P_L x)$.*

(ii) *$P_L P_A^\lambda = P_A^\lambda P_L$.*

The spirit of affine reduction for DR is that *the shadows on the affine-hull of any DR sequence is again a DR sequence*, see [20, Section 3]. The next lemma provides more details.

Lemma 5.25 (shadows of generalized DR sequences). *Let A and B be two closed sets with $L := \mathrm{aff}(A \cup B)$. Let $\alpha_n \in [0,1]$, $\lambda_n, \mu_n \in]1,2]$ and let $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a generalized DR sequence defined by* (132)*. Define also $y_n := P_L x_n$. Then*

(i) *$(y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is also a generalized DR sequence with starting point y_0, more specifically*

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}: \quad y_{n+1} \in (1-\alpha_n)y_n + \alpha_n P_B^{\mu_n} P_A^{\lambda_n} y_n. \tag{133}$$

(ii) *For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $x_{n+1} - y_{n+1} = \big((1-\alpha_n) + \alpha_n(\lambda_n - 1)(\mu_n - 1)\big)(x_n - y_n)$. Consequently, $d_L(x_{n+1}) = \big((1-\alpha_n) + \alpha_n(\lambda_n - 1)(\mu_n - 1)\big) d_L(x_n)$.*

Proof. (i): Let $s_n \in P_A^{\lambda_n}(x_n)$ and $z_n \in P_B^{\mu_n}(s_n)$ such that $x_{n+1} = (1-\alpha_n)x_n + \alpha_n z_n$. By Lemma 5.24, we have

$$z_n - P_L z_n = (1-\mu_n)(s_n - P_L s_n) = (1-\mu_n)(1-\lambda_n)(x_n - P_L x_n) \tag{134a}$$
$$= (1-\mu_n)(1-\lambda_n)(x_n - y_n), \tag{134b}$$

and $P_L z_n \in P_L P_B^{\mu_n} P_A^{\lambda_n} x_n = P_B^{\mu_n} P_A^{\lambda_n} P_L x_n = P_B^{\mu_n} P_A^{\lambda_n} y_n$. Since P_L is an affine operator (see [2, Corollary 3.20]), it follows that

$$y_{n+1} = P_L x_{n+1} = P_L((1-\alpha_n)x_n + \alpha z_n) \tag{135a}$$
$$= (1-\alpha_n)P_L x_n + \alpha_n P_L z_n \tag{135b}$$
$$\in (1-\alpha_n)y_n + \alpha_n P_B^{\mu_n} P_A^{\lambda_n} y_n. \tag{135c}$$

This means $(y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is a generalized DR sequence starting at y_0.

(ii): We have

$$x_{n+1} - y_{n+1} = \big[(1-\alpha_n)x_n + \alpha_n z_n\big] - \big[(1-\alpha_n)P_L x_n - \alpha_n P_L z_n\big] \tag{136a}$$
$$= (1-\alpha_n)(x_n - P_L x_n) + \alpha_n(z_n - P_L z_n) \tag{136b}$$
$$= \big[(1-\alpha_n) + \alpha_n(\lambda_n - 1)(\mu_n - 1)\big](x_n - y_n). \tag{136c}$$

■

In Corollary 5.22, strong regularity of $\{A, B\}$ at $w \in A \cap B$ (see Definition 2.3) is not the most general condition for R-linear convergence of DR sequences. Indeed, it can be relaxed to affine-hull regularity in the following sense

$$N_A(w) \cap (-N_B(w)) \cap (L - w) = \{0\}. \tag{137}$$

This condition has been observed in [20, Theorem 4.7] for the classic DR sequence ($\lambda = \mu = 2$ and $\alpha = 1/2$). We now continue extending such result for generalized DR sequences. For simplicity of presentation, we consider only the case of *constant* parameters $(\lambda_n, \mu_n, \alpha_n) \equiv (\lambda, \mu, \alpha)$.

Theorem 5.26 (affine reduction of DR sequences). *Let A and B be two closed set in X, $w \in A \cap B$, and $L := \operatorname{aff}(A \cup B)$. Suppose $\{A, B\}$ is affine-hull regular at w in the sense of* (137) *and is superregular at w. Let $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a generalized DR sequence given by*

$$x_{n+1} \in T_{\lambda,\mu}^{\alpha} x_n := (1-\alpha)x_n + \alpha P_B^{\mu} P_A^{\lambda} x_n. \tag{138}$$

and let $y_n := P_L x_n$ denote the sequence of shadows on the affine-hull L. The following hold

(i) *If $\lambda = \mu = 2$, then whenever y_0 is sufficiently close to w, the sequence $(y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges R-linearly to a point $\overline{y} \in A \cap B$ and $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges linearly to the point $\overline{x} := \overline{y} + (x_0 - y_0) \in \operatorname{Fix} T_{\lambda,\mu}^{\alpha}$, in particular, $P_L\overline{x} = \overline{y}$.*

(ii) *If either $\lambda < 2$ or $\mu < 2$, then whenever y_0 is sufficiently close to w, both sequences $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges R-linearly to one point $\overline{y} \in A \cap B$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume $w = 0$, thus L is a subspace. By Lemma 5.25(i), $(y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \subset L$ is a DR sequence. By restricting our consideration on the subspace L, affine-hull regularity (137) become strong regularity for $\{A, B\}$ on L. Thus, Corollary 5.22 yields that $(y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges R-linearly to a point $\overline{y} \in A \cap B$ when y_0 is sufficiently close to w.

(i): Lemma 5.25(ii) implies

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}: \quad x_{n+1} - y_{n+1} = \big((1-\alpha) + \alpha(\lambda-1)(\mu-1)\big)(x_n - y_n) \tag{139a}$$

$$= x_n - y_n = \ldots = x_0 - y_0 \in L^{\perp}. \tag{139b}$$

Since $(y_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges R-linearly to $\overline{y} \in A \cap B$, we must have $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges R-linearly to $\overline{x} := \overline{y} + (x_0 - y_0) \in (A \cap B) \oplus L^{\perp} \subseteq \operatorname{Fix} T^{\alpha}_{\lambda,\mu}$. Since $\overline{x} - \overline{y} \in L^{\perp}$, we clearly have $P_L \overline{x} = \overline{y}$.

(ii): Either $\lambda < 2$ or $\mu < 2$ will imply $\beta := (1-\alpha) + \alpha(\lambda-1)(\mu-1) < 1$. Therefore, Lemma 5.25(ii) yields

$$x_n - y_n = \beta(x_{n-1} - y_{n-1}) = \ldots = \beta^n (x_0 - y_0), \tag{140}$$

which means $x_n - y_n$ converges R-linearly to 0. Thus, $x_n = y_n + (x_n - y_n)$ converges R-linearly to $\overline{y} \in A \cap B$. ■

Remark 5.27. Theorem 5.26(ii) has never been observed before even in convex settings where one would obtain global R-linear convergence to the intersection; while Theorem 5.26(i) was proved in [20, Theorem 4.7] for the classic DR. With some care on the parameters, Theorem 5.26 can certainly be extended to the case of generalized DR iterations of the form (132) with $1 < \inf\limits_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \{\lambda_n, \mu_n\} \leq \sup\limits_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \{\lambda_n, \mu_n\} \leq 2$ and $0 < \inf\limits_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \alpha_n \leq \sup\limits_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \alpha_n < 1$.

Acknowledgments

MND was partially supported by an NSERC accelerator grant of Heinz H. Bauschke (University of British Columbia, Kelowna, Canada). HMP was partially supported by a startup research grant of UMass Lowell. This research was partly conducted during HMP's visit at UBC Kelowna in June 2016; and HMP thanks Heinz H. Bauschke for his hospitality in Kelowna, BC, Canada.

References

[1] H.H. Bauschke, J.M. Borwein, and W. Li, Strong conical hull intersection property, bounded linear regularity, Jameson's property (G), and error bounds in convex optimization, *Mathematical Programming, Series A* **86** (1999), 135–160.

[2] H.H. Bauschke and P.L. Combettes, *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*, Springer (2011).

[3] H.H. Bauschke, M.N. Dao, D. Noll, and H.M. Phan, Proximal point algorithm, Douglas–Rachford algorithm and alternating projections: a case study, *Journal of Convex Analysis* **23** (2016), 237–261.

[4] H.H. Bauschke, M.N. Dao, D. Noll, and H.M. Phan, On Slater's condition and finite convergence of the Douglas–Rachford algorithm for solving convex feasibility problems in Euclidean spaces, *Journal of Global Optimization* **65** (2016), 329–349.

[5] H.H. Bauschke, F. Iorio, and V.R. Koch, The method of cyclic intrepid projections: Convergence analysis and numerical experiments, in *The Impact of Applications on Mathematics, Proceedings of the Forum of Mathematics for Industry* (M. Wakayama, R.S. Anderssen, J. Cheng, Y. Fukumoto, R. McKibbin, K. Polthier, T. Takagi, K-C. Toh, eds.) (2013), 187–200 (Springer, Tokyo).

[6] H.H. Bauschke and V.R. Koch, Projection methods: Swiss Army knives for solving feasibility and best approximation problems with halfspaces. *Proc. Workshop Infinite Products of Operators and Their Applications* (S. Reich, A. Zaslavski, eds.) (American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI) (2015), 1–40.

[7] H.H. Bauschke and S.G. Kruk, Reflection-projection method for convex feasibility problems with an obtuse cone, *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* **120** (2004), 503–531.

[8] H.H. Bauschke, D.R. Luke, H.M. Phan, and X. Wang, Restricted normal cones and the method of alternating projections: theory, *Set-Valued and Variational Analysis* **21** (2013), 431–473.

[9] H.H. Bauschke, D.R. Luke, H.M. Phan, and X. Wang, Restricted normal cones and the method of alternating projections: applications, *Set-Valued and Variational Analysis* **21** (2013), 475–501.

[10] H.H. Bauschke, D. Noll, and H.M. Phan, Linear and strong convergence of algorithms involving averaged nonexpansive operators, *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* **421** (2015), 1–20.

[11] H.H. Bauschke, H.M. Phan, and X. Wang, The method of alternating relaxed projections for two nonconvex sets, *Vietnam Journal of Mathematics* **42** (2014), 421–450.

[12] D. Drusvyatskiy, A.D. Ioffe, and A.S. Lewis, Transversality and alternating projections for nonconvex sets, *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* **15** (2015), 1637–1651

[13] J.L. Goffin, The relaxation method for solving systems of linear inequalities, *Mathematics of Operations Research* **5** (1980), 388–414.

[14] R. Hesse and D.R. Luke, Nonconvex notions of regularity and convergence of fundamental algorithms for feasibility problems, *SIAM J. Optim.* **23** (2013), 2397–2419.

[15] A.Y. Kruger, About regularity of collections of sets, *Set-Valued and Variational Analysis*, **14** (2006), 187–206.

[16] A.S. Lewis, D.R. Luke, and J. Malick, Local linear convergence for alternating and averaged nonconvex projections, *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* **9** (2009), 485–513.

[17] D.R. Luke, N.H. Thao, and M.K. Tam, Quantitative convergence analysis of iterated expansive, set-valued mappings, arXiv:1605.05725, preprint.

[18] B.S. Mordukhovich, *Variational Analysis and Generalized Differentiation I*, Springer–Verlag (2006).

[19] D. Noll and A. Rondepierre, On local convergence of the method of alternating projections, *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* **16** (2016), 425–455

[20] H.M. Phan, Linear convergence of the Douglas–Rachford method for two closed sets, *Optimization* **65** (2016), 369–385.

[21] R.T. Rockafellar, R. J-B Wets, *Variational Analysis*, Springer, New York (2009)